

# DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 081 433

JC 730 217

AUTHOR Korman, Abraham K.; And Others  
TITLE An Exploratory Study of Enlistment Incentives Among Junior College Students.  
INSTITUTION American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences, Silver Spring, Md.  
SPONS AGENCY Office of Naval Research, Wasnington, D.C. Personnel and Training Research Programs Office.  
REPORT NO AIR-32201-6-73-TM-1  
PUB DATE Jun-73  
NOTE 44p.; Navy Career Motivation Programs in an All-Volunteer Condition  
  
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29  
DESCRIPTORS \*Junior College Students; \*Military Service; \*Motivation; Post Secondary Education; Questionnaires; \*Recruitment; \*Student Attitudes; Technical Reports

## ABSTRACT

A questionnaire designed to assess reaction to possible enlistment incentives was administered to 100 junior college students. A factor-analysis of the measure indicated the importance both of traditional tangible incentives and of the "newer" incentives of control over one's work life. The data also indicated that: a) individuals term low socioeconomic levels were less attracted to the Navy overall than those from middle-or-upper levels, and b) the traditional incentives were more important for the low socioeconomic respondents while the newer incentives were more important for those from the upper levels. (Author/KM)

AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH  
WASHINGTON OFFICES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-  
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM  
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-  
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS  
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT  
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Address: 8555 Sixteenth Street, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

Telephone: (301) 587-8201

AIR-32201-6/73-TM-1

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF ENLISTMENT INCENTIVES  
AMONG JUNIOR COLLEGE STUDENTS

Abraham K. Korman  
Barry E. Goodstadt  
Albert S. Glickman  
Alan P. Romanczuk

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM No. 1

Navy Career Motivation Programs in an All-Volunteer Condition

Principal Investigator: Albert S. Glickman

JUNE 1973

This report was prepared under the Navy Manpower R&D  
Program of the Office of Naval Research under Contract  
N00014-72-C-0387.

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.  
Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any  
purpose of the United States Government.

JC 730 217

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors of this report wish to acknowledge the support of the many persons who helped complete this phase of the Navy Career Motivation project. Special thanks go to Dr. Marshall J. Farr, Director of Personnel and Training Research Programs for the Office of Naval Research (Scientific Officer for the Career Motivation project) and Assistant Director, Dr. Joseph L. Young. Dr. Lester Frankfurt and Dr. Leonard Rosenbaum of Montgomery College, and Dr. Jeffrey Greenhaus of City University of New York helped us obtain junior college samples.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	i
OBJECTIVES . . . . .	1
METHOD . . . . .	3
ANALYSES AND RESULTS . . . . .	5
DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS . . . . .	22
REFERENCES . . . . .	23
APPENDIX A . . . . .	24

## OBJECTIVES

In order to develop an administrative strategy to insure that the Navy has available a sufficient complement of competent and career-motivated personnel, we have suggested (Glickman, Goodstadt, Korman & Romanczuk, 1973), that a number of approaches might be both feasible and worthwhile. For example, one approach entails the operation of a series of small-scale administrative experiments which would yield understanding regarding the potential impact of incentives and organizational changes on Navy personnel. Following evaluation of such experimental programs and demonstrations of their effectiveness, changes might then be introduced on a Navy-wide basis to enhance recruiting and retention efforts. Of particular importance is that such organizational changes and incentives have appeal for those who are qualified to meet the Navy's technical requirements.

A general conceptual model of the career motivation process has been developed (Glickman, et al., 1973) as an aid in identifying those parameters of change that might have the greatest influence upon career motivation in the Navy. This model points out different types of organizational and incentive changes that appear most promising to introduce and evaluate in the form of limited-scale administrative experiments.

The research described in the present report is a step in the direction of developing and evaluating organizational and incentive changes for enhancing career motivation. Our focus in undertaking the work involved stems from the following considerations:

1. We seek to supplement interview data gathered during the first phase of the project (as documented in our initial report) by the use of a questionnaire procedure. Our content goal is to obtain additional information regarding possible incentives that might influence Naval career motivation and the shape and intrinsic characteristics of these incentives. It is felt that this additional information should come from different methodological procedures in order to complement dimensions that came out of our interview data. In cases where the incentive dimensions uncovered by interviews and by the questionnaires are similar, additional analysis enables us to specify more precisely the specific attributes comprising those dimensions.

In turn, such specifics are then useful for developing experiments with administrative innovations and new policies aiming to enhance career motivation.

2. A second aim of this research is to broaden our data base to insure adequate representation of specific and concrete administrative policies which might be employed in an incentive manipulation approach to influencing the enlistment process. We want to examine the adequacy of the range of incentives we have surveyed in our previous research and in our reviews of other research (cf. Gilbert Youth Survey Report, 1972) and to enable us to identify the major incentives available. Out of this pool of incentives, we wish to identify those incentives which seem to have considerable promise for influencing individuals to enlist in the Navy.

3. As a third consideration, we are also interested in exploring the generalizability and adequacy of our incentives for a specific population of interest, the junior college student, because, as indicated previously, (Glickman, et al., 1973), junior colleges tend to attract individuals who have: (a) the ability, motivation and self-discipline to successfully compete in achievement settings; as well as (b) a high degree of vocational and, often technical, work interest. Given the increasingly technical orientation of the Navy, there may be considerable untapped resources in junior colleges from which the Navy might recruit interested individuals.

## METHOD

### Questionnaire

The basic instrument used in this research was a 38-item questionnaire which reflected a variety of incentives that might be employed by the Navy for recruiting in an all-volunteer setting. These incentives reflected the types of concerns and motivational variables found in our interviews (Glickman, et. al., 1973), and in the existing research literature (Gilbert Report, 1971).

A preliminary revision of the 38-item questionnaire was pre-tested on civilian personnel to assure comprehensibility and relevance. Following pre-testing, a final form of the questionnaire was developed (see Appendix A). The responses to Navy recruiting incentives were made along a five-point scale ranging from thinking "less favorably of the Navy" to thinking "more favorably of the Navy and would seriously consider enlisting."

### Sample

A total of 100 male community college students constituted the sample of this research. These students were contacted at two campuses of a suburban community college outside of Washington, D.C. and an inner-city community college in New York City. None of the respondents had ever been in the service and none had any current commitment to a military service. The demographic makeup of this sample (as determined by self-report items on the questionnaire) is shown in Table 1.

### Administration

The questionnaire was administered to students in classes by their regular college instructors. All respondents were told the basic nature of the project and were assured of anonymity.

TABLE 1  
Junior College Sample Characteristics  
(N=100)

<u>Age</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Father's Occupation</u>	<u>N</u>
18-19 yr.	45	Lower-middle class	10
20-21 yr.	36	Middle-middle class	36
22-over	19	Upper-middle class	27
		Retired	4
		Deceased	9
		Nonrespondents	14
<u>Highest Grade Completed</u>		<u>Consideration of Other Armed Service(s)</u>	
12th	44	No	74
13th	35	Yes:	
14th	7	Air Force	12
Nonrespondents	14	Army	6
		Other	4
		Nonrespondents	4
 <u>Interest in the Navy</u>			
		Am not interested in the Navy	65
		Have not given much thought to joining	24
		Am thinking about joining	4
		Am thinking about joining and would like more information	1
		Am definitely going to join the Navy	0
		Nonrespondents	6



## ANALYSES AND RESULTS

### A. The Descriptive Analysis

The method used to determine the incentive dimensions encompassed by the questionnaire was a principle-components factor analysis with an orthogonal varimax rotation to simple structure.

This analysis resulted in a total of six factors that could be given meaningful interpretation and which accounted for 68.8 percent of the common variance. The item loadings on each factor are shown in Tables 2 through 7. A cut-off point of .40 was used to indicate a "significant" loading. The interpretation of these findings and their relationship to our research goals is as follows:

Factor One: Opportunity for self-determination (Table 2). This factor, accounting for 48.0 percent of the common variance, was concerned with self-determination; that is, having control over one's own fate. Thus, incentive items 18, 26, 28, 29 and 31 (see Appendix A for questions) all seem to have the common thread of encouraging the potential enlistee to believe that he would not be completely under the control of the Navy and that he would be able to retain personal control over important aspects of his life. Since this motivational theme was also a common element in the interviews previously reported (Glickman, *et. al.*, 1973), this outcome is consistent in showing that the desire for self-determination and fate control are important influences on career motivation. In addition, the present finding provides some explicit details regarding those incentives that may impinge on self-perceived powerlessness and fate control. These specific incentives will therefore be useful for application in later research.

Factor Two: Opportunity for vocational and financial satisfactions (Table 3). This second factor accounted for 6.0 percent of the common variance and is also quite similar to some of the motivational themes described in previous work. As we have indicated earlier, it would seem that the increasing value that young men assign to self-actualization and meaningful control over their vocational and personal life has not been

TABLE 2

## Factor One: Opportunity for Self-Determination

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Loading</u>
18. Educational leave at full pay for 2 months a year.	.75
25. Periodic visits by dependents while at sea, which would be paid for by the Navy.	.72
26. A policy of guaranteed location assignments after your initial tour.	.72
31. The right to leave the Navy at any time after 2 years, with no strings attached.	.67
29. The right to live off the base after boot camp, if you prefer.	.67
28. Assurance that you will be able to change your job after 1 year if you don't like it.	.66
33. 30 days paid vacation each year.	.60
11. An opportunity to get out of the Navy after 6 months, if you are not satisfied, with no strings attached.	.58
32. Free long distance phone calls to dependents when separated for more than 2 weeks (one free call every 2 weeks).	.57
22. An opportunity to work in jobs that have clear civilian transferability.	.55
20. Eliminate drilling and reduce physical training aspects of Navy boot camp.	.53
21. An opportunity to accumulate unused leave time up to 180 days.	.53
30. Redesigning military quarters on shore bases in order to provide for one and two-man rooms with bath.	.52
27. A chance to enroll in an officer training program immediately after completing 2 years of college (or junior college).	.51

TABLE 2 (Cont'd.)

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Loading</u>
23. More pay for sea duty than for shore duty.	.49
34. Guarantee of the Navy vocational school of your choice at enlistment.	.44
1. A \$1000 bonus at the time of enlistment	.41
14. The opportunity to retire at half pay, with medical benefits after 15 years of service.	.41

TABLE 3

## Factor Two: Opportunity for Vocational and Financial Satisfaction

<u>Item #</u>		<u>Loading</u>
4.	A \$3000 bonus at the time of enlistment with no strings attached.	.80
3.	An enlistment of 2 years instead of 3 or 4 years.	.76
2.	The Navy would help you get started in a civilian job after finishing your active duty, by providing training in a civilian skill.	.73
5.	As an enlisted man, you would be paid by the government for up to four years of college, including living expenses, at the school of your choice, in return for four years of active duty.	.65
1.	A \$1000 bonus at the time of enlistment.	.65
6.	People who have been to college for one or two years would enter at higher pay grades than persons who have not had any college.	.63
8.	An opportunity to work in the home port area of your choice for the first 2 years of your enlistment.	.59
7.	The Navy would pay up to two years of technical/vocational school training, including living expenses, at the school of your choice, in return for four years of active duty.	.55
12.	A 9 month leave of absence at full pay for educational and/or other personal growth activities every 6 years.	.43
17.	A \$5000 bonus at the time of enlistment with no strings attached.	.43
21.	An opportunity to accumulate unused leave time up to 180 days.	.41

accompanied by a devaluation of vocational and financial satisfactions. These traditional concerns continue to be important as shown by our interviews and as documented here.

Factor Three: Opportunity for retirement benefits (Table 4). This factor accounted for 5.5 percent of the common variance, and is rather specific in nature. Two major item loadings reflect the extent to which individuals value currently existing Navy retirement benefits. A third significant loading (Item 34) is not consistent with this interpretation. However, it also loads significantly on Factor One and is consistent with the "Opportunity for Self-Determination" interpretation of that grouping.

It may be noted that the "opportunity for retirement benefits" is not a frequently cited factor in our interviews. Its occurrence here, therefore, constitutes an addition to the findings of that earlier study.

Factor Four: Opportunity for integration of military and civilian life (Table 5). In Factor Four, which accounts for 3.5 percent of the common variance, we seem to be dealing with a view of the Navy in the same career framework with civilian employers. The Navy, as an organization offering employment, is viewed here as part of a whole set of employers that exist in an individual's perceptual field, all of whom are interrelated in terms of degree of skill and occupational transferability. This factor emerges as consistent with our earlier interview research. In addition, it adds information as to specific incentives underlying this dimension which can be used when we address ourselves to the linkage of military and civilian careers and how such linkages impact on career motivation. (It may be noted that several retirement items that load on this factor also form the more specific Factor Three. This is not inconsistent with our general interpretation since retirement benefits can be seen both in terms of their specific enlistment incentive values, and in terms of their congruence with an individual's plan for a civilian career after leaving the Navy.)

Factor Five: Release option (Table 6). This factor, which accounted for 2.9 percent of the common variance, has as its major motivational thrust the individual's desire to be able to reject and/or change aversive factors

TABLE 4  
Factor Three: Opportunity for Retirement Benefits

<u>Item #</u>		<u>Loading</u>
38.	The opportunity to retire from the Navy at 3/4 pay after 30 years.	.81
36.	The opportunity to retire from the Navy at half pay with medical benefits after 20 years.	.72
34.	Guarantee of the Navy vocational school of your choice at enlistment.	.58

TABLE 5

## Factor Four: Opportunity for Integration of Military &amp; Civilian Life

<u>Item #</u>		<u>Loading</u>
14.	The opportunity to retire at half pay, with medical benefits after 15 years of service.	.67
16.	Retirement at 3/4 pay, with medical benefits, after 20 years.	.63
7.	The Navy would pay up to two years of technical/vocational school training, including living expenses, at the school of your choice, in return for four years of active duty.	.50
15.	A policy of making pay and allowances on all jobs in the Navy comparable to civilian pay and benefits for smaller jobs.	.49
8.	An opportunity to work in the home port area of your choice for the first 2 years of your enlistment.	.48
36.	The opportunity to retire from the Navy at half pay with medical benefits after 20 years.	.46
12.	A 9 month leave of absence at full pay for educational and/or other personal growth activities every 6 years.	.43
9.	A special allowance for high-cost of living areas such as New York City, Washington, etc.	.43

TABLE 6

## Factor Five: Release Option

<u>Item #</u>		<u>Loading</u>
35.	The ability to leave the Navy at any time by paying a fee of \$500 with no strings attached.	.82
30.	Redesigning military quarters on shore bases in order to provide for one and two-man rooms with bath.	.51
20.	Eliminate drilling and reduce physical training aspects of Navy boot camp.	.40



i.e., some of the tangible conditions of military life. Positive affect is associated with reduction of these aversive conditions. This may be accomplished by changes made by the Navy, or by the individual leaving the Navy. The thrust of this factor fits in quite well with the findings revealed by interviews.

Factor Six: Reduction of perceived inequities (Table 7). The last factor, "Reduction of perceived inequities" accounted for 2.8 percent of the common variance, and reflects the degree to which the Navy, as an employing institution, is perceived as providing the same job opportunities, i.e., money, interaction with opposite sex ("assign women to duty aboard ship"), and vacation time, as do civilian employers. The major theme of this factor is that the more the Navy reduces these perceived inequities, (i.e., inequities as defined by what is commonly available in civilian life)--the better.

#### The Identification of the Most Promising Incentives

In the process of developing incentives to enhance enlistment, we were guided by a number of considerations. First, there was the need to insure a sufficiently wide range of incentive content from which we could draw a variety of different kinds of incentives outside of the conventional domain of monetary bonuses and educational benefits. A second consideration was the possibility that particular incentives might have different degrees of appeal for different segments of the Navy eligible population. To the extent that this were the case, it would contribute to the design of our research and development program. In order to assess this possibility, we undertook an exploratory analysis of limited sample size to give us some preliminary information as to whether certain incentives did have differential appeal for individuals from different socio-economic backgrounds. Using the father's occupation as a measure of socio-economic background and eliminating cases where the father was unemployed or deceased, or where his occupation was undeterminable, the socio-economic status of 73 respondents could be classified. A three category classification was used, based on whether the father was employed in a professional or high technical occupation, in a skilled-trade occupation, or in a job involving relatively low-level, somewhat menial tasks. Those whose fathers were classified in the first group were considered to be of Upper Middle (UM) socio-economic

TABLE 7

## Factor Six: Reduction of Perceived Inequities

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Loading</u>
19. Assign women to duty aboard ship.	.75
24. A policy of bonuses for exceptionally good performance.	.65
23. More pay for sea duty than for shore duty.	.56
22. An opportunity to work in jobs that have clear civilian transferability.	.48
17. A \$5000 bonus at the time of enlistment with no strings attached.	.46
32. Free long distance phone calls to dependents when separated for more than 2 weeks (one free call every 2 weeks).	.45
11. An opportunity to get out of the Navy after 6 months, if you are not satisfied, with no strings attached.	.45
10. A requirement that uniforms be worn only one day per week (and on special occasions) while on shore duty.	.45
15. A policy of making pay and allowances on all jobs in the Navy comparable to civilian pay and benefits for smaller jobs.	.45
6. People who have been to college for one or two years would enter at higher pay grades than persons who have not had any college.	.43
13. A 20% pay increase across the board (starting salary before the increase is \$288 per month plus clothing, room, board, educational and medical benefits).	.41
33. 30 days paid vacation each year.	.41
21. An opportunity to accumulate unused leave time up to 180 days.	.41

status (N=27), those from the second group were considered to be of Middle (M) socio-economic status (N=36), while those from the last group were assigned to the Lower (L) socio-economic level (N=10).

Relevant data from this analysis are shown in Tables 8, 9, and 10. In Table 8 are listed the mean ratings of each incentive, by socio-economic grouping, while Table 9 presents those items ranked highest by members of each socio-economic subgroup (i.e., UM, M, & L) and pairs of sub-groups (UM & M). Also presented in Table 9 are the factors on which each of these items loaded (e.g., Item 5, which had a mean rating of 3.25 for the L group, loaded .65 on Factor II-Opportunity for Vocational and Financial Satisfaction). Table 10 gives corresponding data for the whole sample (those classified regarding socio-economic status, as well as those individuals who could not be so classified).

An examination of these tables suggests the following:

1. There is some indication from column means shown in Table 8 that among junior college students the most favorable overall feelings toward the Navy exist for those with either UM or M backgrounds, while those from L backgrounds seem to be least attracted (means 3.07 and 3.11 vs. 2.90). This conclusion is, of course, based on very small samples and only cautious generalization is warranted. Yet, subject to further confirmation, there is here the suggestion that the incentives evaluated in this study are least effective for attracting persons from lower socio-economic backgrounds.

2. The locus of problems associated with attracting L-category persons may be pinpointed in Table 9. With decreasing socio-economic status, the significance of tangible incentives becomes stronger; while the items reflecting aspiration for "self-control" and "equity" become stronger with increasing socio-economic status. That is, Factors II and IV are more important among those of lower SES, while Factors I and VII are more important to those of higher SES.

Taken together, these findings suggest three interrelated but distinguishable administrative implications. First, the fact that differences exist between the socio-economic levels such that upper middle class persons are more attracted to the Navy than persons lower in socio-economic status

TABLE 8

Mean Ratings and Standard Deviations for Incentives for Total Sample  
and the Sub-samples Based on Father's Occupation

Item	Total Sample N=100		Upper-Middle Background N=27		Middle-(Skilled) Worker Background N=36		Low-Socio- Economic Background N=10	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
1.	2.67	0.93	2.48	0.70	2.86	1.03	2.30	1.06
2.	3.09	1.00	3.15	0.99	3.17	1.12	2.80	0.79
3.	3.02	1.08	3.04	0.90	3.09	1.16	2.50	1.35
4.	3.15	1.13	3.00	1.10	3.24	1.18	3.10	1.10
5.	3.25	1.01	3.19	1.06	3.19	1.01	3.40	1.17
6.	3.07	1.08	3.19	0.83	3.22	1.12	2.30	1.25
7.	2.69	0.92	2.67	0.73	2.67	1.07	2.70	0.95
8.	2.89	1.06	3.04	1.02	3.06	1.17	2.80	1.32
9.	2.89	0.78	2.93	0.78	2.92	0.87	2.70	0.82
10.	2.81	0.95	2.93	0.78	2.69	0.90	2.10	1.10
11.	3.58	1.08	3.63	1.15	3.67	0.96	3.20	1.48
12.	3.03	0.95	2.93	0.87	2.97	1.03	2.90	0.99
13.	3.14	0.91	3.12	0.95	3.17	1.00	3.10	0.99
14.	2.95	1.09	2.89	1.15	3.03	1.20	3.10	1.10
15.	3.04	0.99	3.08	1.02	3.09	1.09	2.90	1.20
16.	3.05	0.98	3.00	1.04	3.17	0.95	3.30	0.95
17.	3.42	1.14	3.30	1.07	3.61	1.08	3.00	1.05
18.	3.09	0.93	3.33	1.07	3.03	0.97	3.10	0.88
19.	3.19	1.13	3.41	1.01	3.06	1.21	2.90	1.29
20.	2.75	1.17	2.85	1.20	2.62	1.16	2.40	1.08
21.	3.19	0.90	3.07	0.92	3.37	0.91	3.00	1.00
22.	3.30	0.95	3.26	0.98	3.50	0.94	2.90	0.88
23.	3.09	0.99	2.96	1.02	3.19	1.01	3.00	1.05
24.	3.15	1.03	3.26	1.06	3.14	0.93	2.90	1.20
25.	3.08	1.08	3.11	1.19	3.11	1.04	3.20	1.23
26.	3.16	0.97	3.11	1.05	3.31	0.92	3.30	1.16
27.	3.25	1.03	3.26	1.10	3.31	0.96	3.20	1.32
28.	3.21	1.01	3.22	1.12	3.25	1.00	2.90	1.29
29.	3.27	0.97	3.26	1.10	3.33	0.93	3.00	0.94
30.	3.10	0.88	3.00	0.94	3.06	0.80	2.80	0.92
31.	3.40	0.99	3.44	0.97	3.50	1.00	2.90	1.20
32.	3.11	0.90	3.00	0.92	3.19	0.79	3.00	1.15
33.	3.33	0.90	3.37	0.97	3.31	0.82	3.30	1.34
34.	3.09	0.92	3.19	0.92	2.94	0.98	3.10	1.10
35.	2.65	1.29	2.81	1.27	2.47	1.23	2.50	1.27
36.	2.81	0.92	2.73	0.60	2.94	1.08	2.80	1.23
37.	2.90	0.90	2.81	0.85	2.97	0.94	3.20	1.14
38.	2.70	0.95	2.69	0.88	2.86	1.02	2.60	1.08
Overall Mean			3.07		3.11		2.90	

TABLE 9

## Factor Patterns According to Socio-Economic Background

Most Important Incentives	Mean	Factors and Factor Loadings			
		I	II	IV	VII
<u>Upper Middle (N=27)</u>					
19. Assign women to duty aboard ship.	3.19				.75
24. A policy of bonuses for exceptionally good performance.	3.14				.65
18. Educational leave at full pay for 2 months a year.	3.09			.75	
<u>Upper Middle (N=27) &amp; Middle (N=36)</u>					
17. A \$5000 bonus at the time of enlistment with no strings attached.	3.42		.43		.46
31. The right to leave the Navy at any time after 2 years, with no strings attached.	3.40			.67	
22. An opportunity to work in jobs that have clear civilian transferability.	3.30			.55	.48
29. The right to live off the base after boot camp, if you prefer.	3.27			.67	
28. Assurance that you will be able to change your job after 1 year if you don't like it.	3.21			.66	
<u>Middle (N=36)</u>					
21. An opportunity to accumulate unused leave time up to 180 days.	3.19		.53		.41
4. A \$3000 bonus at the time of enlistment with no strings attached.	3.15		.80		
6. People who have been to college for one or two years would enter at higher pay grades than persons who have not had any college.	3.07		.63		.43

TABLE 9 (Cont'd.)

Most Important Incentives	Factors and Factor Loadings				
	Mean	I	II	IV	VII
<u>Middle (N=36) &amp; Lower (N=10)</u>					
26. A policy of guaranteed location assignments after your initial tour.	3.16		.72		
<u>Lower (N=10)</u>					
5. As an enlisted man, you would be paid by the government for up to four years of college, including living expenses, at the school of your choice, in return for four years of active duty.	3.25		.65		.43
25. Periodic visits by dependents while at sea, which would be paid for by the Navy.	3.08		.72		
16. Retirement at 3/4 pay, with medical benefits, after 20 years.	3.05				.63

TABLE 10

Most Important Incentives and Factor Loadings for the  
Entire Sample of Junior College Students

Most Important Incentives	Factors and Factor Loadings				
	Mean	I	II	IV	VII
11. An opportunity to get out of the Navy after 6 months, if you are not satisfied, with no strings attached.	3.58	.58			.45
33. Thirty (30) days paid vacation each year.	3.33	.59			.41
27. A chance to enroll in an officer training program immediately after completing 2 years of college (or junior college).	3.26	.56			

suggests that something might need to be done to increase the attractiveness of the Navy for those from lower socio-economic backgrounds.

Secondly, the fact that there are variations in the manner by which persons of different socio-economic groupings respond to incentives reinforces the view that varied incentives and appeals should be developed and directed at different target populations of potential enlistees. One means of doing this may be to have these appeals generated and reviewed with the help of individuals from different backgrounds, i.e., those who have knowledge of, or who can adopt the different "frames of reference" most easily.

Third, these results also suggest that a group not often thought of as being interested in a Navy career (i.e., those from upper middle class backgrounds) might be a rich source of potential enlistees. Thus, our data show that certain appeals may be most useful for attracting young men from upper middle class backgrounds and that appeals to such persons could be given more emphasis by the Navy. There has been a tendency by recruiters and Navy officials in the past to consider this group (and college students in general) as unreachable. Hence, such populations have been relatively neglected as an enlisted recruiting pool.

3. The differences in the attractiveness of incentives for the different subgroups of potential enlistees should not be allowed to obscure the incentives which appear to be common to all subgroups (Table 10). Thus, while some difference in attractiveness of certain incentives may occur as a function of socio-economic status, junior college students in general seem to be attracted both by the opportunity to (a) exercise control of their vocational and career life as much as possible, and (b) by traditional incentives, such as money, advancement opportunities and working conditions.

4. Finally, these results suggest that the utilization of population characteristics may be useful for defining differential appeals and differential approaches in future research and administrative applications. It appears necessary to further examine these findings using larger, more systematically defined samples in order to evaluate the utility of segmenting potential populations of recruits according to socio-economic variables.



In addition, there is also a need to test more fully the utility of segmenting the "market" according to such variables as urban-suburban, rural location, career interests, and related dimensions.

## DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Suggestions for the Navy recruiting effort in the all-volunteer environment will become increasingly explicit as we obtain additional information. Thus, while the data presented here are only exploratory and reflect our hypothesis and model-generating interests at this time, several indications have emerged regarding the enlistment motives of junior college students. First, they wish to retain considerable control over their vocational and their personal lives. Second, they are interested in "traditional" vocational work incentives such as money, the opportunity for advancement, good vacations and working conditions. From these data, we would hypothesize that the current generation of junior college students differs from previous generations of college students and high school graduates in that they expect "more" from the Navy. They want both traditional incentives and increased opportunity for self-control. However, it also needs to be noted that the relative weight of these factors may be different for those of different socio-economic backgrounds in that the more "tangible" traditional incentives seem to be more important at lower socio-economic levels. There is considerable evidence in the research literature that these types of work values are quite typical of those from lower socio-economic backgrounds (cf. Davis, 1946; Goodale, 1973). Thus, while our samples in this study were of a size most appropriate for exploratory analysis, the substantive conclusions drawn are strengthened by this previous work.

The implications from these findings are several. First, it will be necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of incentives reflecting both "new" and "traditional" appeals. Second, incentives need to be selected on the basis of their appropriateness and attractiveness for specific populations in order to maximize their potential for influencing enlistment decisions. Our previous discussions have suggested that one possible procedure might be to have representatives of different socio-economic groups contribute to the development of incentives responsive to the varying motivational characteristics of different target populations.

## REFERENCES

- Davis, A. The motivation of the underprivileged worker. In W.F. Whyte (Ed.), Industry and society. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1946.
- Gilbert Youth Research, Inc. and Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO), Attitudes of youth toward military service: Results of a national survey conducted May, 1971. Alexandria, Virginia: HumRRO, 1972.
- Glickman, A. S., Goodstadt, B. E., Korman, A. K., & Romanczuk, A. P. Research and development for Navy career motivation programs in an all-volunteer condition: I. A cognitive map of career motivation. Washington: American Institutes for Research, 1973.
- Goodale, J. G. Effects of personal background and training on work values of the hard-core unemployed. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, Vol. 57, 1-9.

## APPENDIX A

AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH  
NAVY ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

The American Institutes for Research, a private, nonprofit organization, is conducting a study of young mens' attitudes toward the Navy. We would appreciate your cooperation in filling out this questionnaire. Your answers will remain confidential and your name is not required. Please answer the questions on the first page before turning to page two where additional instructions will be given.

1. At this time, I:  
(circle appropriate answer)
  - a. Am not interested in the Navy.
  - b. Have not given much thought to joining the Navy.
  - c. Am thinking about joining the Navy.
  - d. Am thinking about joining the Navy and would like more information about Navy programs.
  - e. Am definitely going to join the Navy.
2. Age: \_\_\_\_ years \_\_\_\_ months
3. Highest school grade completed: \_\_\_\_
4. Father's occupation \_\_\_\_\_
5. Have you ever been in a military service? \_\_\_\_ (yes/no)  
If so, which one? \_\_\_\_\_
6. Have you considered any armed service other than the Navy? \_\_\_\_ (yes/no)  
If so, which one? \_\_\_\_\_

## Instructions

As the military draft comes to an end, the Navy is expecting to make some changes. Basically, the idea is to see how some of these possible changes might affect the plans of young men with respect to enlisting in the Navy. Below you will find descriptions of a number of changes which the Navy may consider adopting in order to attract more people like yourself. Before each description, you will find five choices, a, b, c, d, e. Circle the letter you feel most accurately describes how that particular change might affect you. Use the following key making your ratings:

- a. If this change were introduced, I would think less favorably of the Navy.
  - b. If this change were introduced, I would think neither more or less favorably of the Navy.
  - c. If this change were introduced, I would think more favorably of the Navy.
  - d. If this change were introduced, I would think more favorably of the Navy and would try to get more information about Navy programs.
  - e. If this change were introduced, I would think more favorably and would seriously consider enlisting in the Navy.
- 

- a b c d e 1. A \$1000 bonus at the time of enlistment.
- a b c d e 2. The Navy would help you get started in a civilian job after finishing your active duty, by providing training in a civilian skill.
- a b c d e 3. An enlistment of 2 years instead of 3 or 4 years.
- a b c d e 4. A \$3000 bonus at the time of enlistment with no strings attached.
- a b c d e 5. As an enlisted man, you would be paid by the government for up to four years of college, including living expenses, at the school of your choice, in return for four years of active duty.
- a b c d e 6. People who have been to college for one or two years would enter at higher pay grades than persons who have not had any college.
- a b c d e 7. The Navy would pay up to two years of technical/vocational school training, including living expenses, at the school of your choice, in return for four years of active duty.
- a b c d e 8. An opportunity to work in the home port area of your choice for the first 2 years of your enlistment.

- a. If this change were introduced, I would think less favorably of the Navy.
- b. If this change were introduced, I would think neither more or less favorably of the Navy.
- c. If this change were introduced, I would think more favorably of the Navy.
- d. If this change were introduced, I would think more favorably of the Navy and would try to get more information about Navy programs.
- e. If this change were introduced, I would think more favorably and would seriously consider enlisting in the Navy.

- 
- a b c d e 9. A special allowance for high-cost of living areas such as New York City, Washington, etc.
  - a b c d e 10. A requirement that uniforms be worn only one day per week (and on special occasions) while on shore duty.
  - a b c d e 11. An opportunity to get out of the Navy after 6 months, if you are not satisfied, with no strings attached.
  - a b c d e 12. A 9 month leave of absence at full pay for educational and/or other personal growth activities every 6 years.
  - a b c d e 13. A 20% pay increase across the board (starting salary before the increase is \$288 per month plus clothing, room, board, educational and medical benefits).
  - a b c d e 14. The opportunity to retire at half pay, with medical benefits after 15 years of service.
  - a b c d e 15. A policy of making pay and allowances on all jobs in the Navy comparable to civilian pay and benefits for similar jobs.
  - a b c d e 16. Retirement at 3/4 pay, with medical benefits, after 20 years.
  - a b c d e 17. A \$5000 bonus at the time of enlistment with no strings attached.
  - a b c d e 18. Educational leave at full pay for 2 months a year.
  - a b c d e 19. Assign women to duty aboard ship.
  - a b c d e 20. Eliminate drilling and reduce physical training aspects of Navy boot camp.

- a. If this change were introduced, I would think less favorably of the Navy.
- b. If this change were introduced, I would think neither more or less favorably of the Navy.
- c. If this change were introduced, I would think more favorably of the Navy.
- d. If this change were introduced, I would think more favorably of the Navy and would try to get more information about Navy programs.
- e. If this change were introduced, I would think more favorably and would seriously consider enlisting in the Navy.

- 
- a b c d e 21. An opportunity to accumulate unused leave time up to 180 days.
  - a b c d e 22. An opportunity to work in jobs that have clear civilian transferability.
  - a b c d e 23. More pay for sea duty than for shore duty.
  - a b c d e 24. A policy of bonuses for exceptionally good performance.
  - a b c d e 25. Periodic visits by dependents while at sea, which would be paid for by the Navy.
  - a b c d e 26. A policy of guaranteed location assignments after your initial tour.
  - a b c d e 27. A chance to enroll in an officer training program immediately after completing 2 years of college (or junior college).
  - a b c d e 28. Assurance that you will be able to change your job after 1 year if you don't like it.
  - a b c d e 29. The right to live off the base after boot camp, if you prefer.
  - a b c d e 30. Redesigning military quarters on shore bases in order to provide for one and two-man rooms with bath.
  - a b c d e 31. The right to leave the Navy at any time after 2 years, with no strings attached.
  - a b c d e 32. Free long distance phone calls to dependents when separated for more than 2 weeks (one free call every 2 weeks).
  - a b c d e 33. 30 days paid vacation each year.
  - a b c d e 34. Guarantee of the Navy vocational school of your choice at enlistment.
  - a b c d e 35. The ability to leave the Navy at any time by paying a fee of \$500, with no strings attached.



- a. If this change were introduced, I would think less favorably of the Navy.
  - b. If this change were introduced, I would think neither more or less favorably of the Navy.
  - c. If this change were introduced, I would think more favorably of the Navy.
  - d. If this change were introduced, I would think more favorably of the Navy and would try to get more information about Navy programs.
  - e. If this change were introduced, I would think more favorably and would seriously consider enlisting in the Navy.
- 

- a b c d e 36. The opportunity to retire from the Navy at half pay with medical benefits after 20 years.
- a b c d e 37. Guaranteed two year duty overseas in the country of your choice.
- a b c d e 38. The opportunity to retire from the Navy at 3/4 pay after 30 years.

# DISTRIBUTION LIST

## NAVY

- |    |   |   |   |
|----|---|---|---|
| 4  | Dr. Marshall J. Farr<br>Director, Personnel and Training<br>Research Programs (Code 458)<br>Office of Naval Research<br>Arlington, Virginia 22217     | 1 | Chief of Naval Technical Training<br>Naval Air Station Memphis (75)<br>Millington, Tennessee 38054<br>ATTN: Dr. G. D. Mayo  |
| 1  | Director<br>ONR Branch Office<br>495 Summer Street<br>Boston, Massachusetts 02210   | 1 | Chief of Naval Training<br>Naval Air Station<br>Pensacola, Florida 32508<br>ATTN: CAPT. Allen E. McMichael  |
| 1  | Director<br>ONR Branch Office<br>1030 East Green Street<br>Pasadena, California 91101   | 1 | Chief<br>Bureau of Medicine and Surgery<br>Research Division (Code 713)<br>Washington, D. C. 20390  |
| 1  | Director<br>ONR Branch Office<br>536 South Clark Street<br>Chicago, Illinois 60605  | 1 | Commandant of the Marine Corps<br>(Code A01M)<br>Washington, D. C. 20380  |
| 1  | Office of Naval Research<br>Area Office<br>207 West 24th Street<br>New York, New York 10011   | 1 | Commander<br>Naval Air Systems Command<br>Navy Department, AIR-413C<br>Washington, D. C. 20360  |
| 6  | Director<br>Naval Research Laboratory<br>Code 2627<br>Washington, D. C. 20390   | 1 | Commander<br>Submarine Development Group Two<br>Fleet Post Office<br>New York, New York 09501   |
| 12 | Defense Documentation Center<br>Cameron Station, Building 5<br>5010 Duke Street<br>Alexandria, Virginia 22314   | 1 | Commanding Officer<br>Naval Personnel and Training<br>Research Laboratory<br>San Diego, California 92152  |
| 1  | Chairman<br>Behavioral Science Department<br>Naval Command and Management<br>Division<br>U.S. Naval Academy<br>Luce Hall<br>Annapolis, Maryland 21402 | 1 | Head, Personnel Measurement Staff<br>Capital Area Personnel Service<br>Office<br>Ballston Tower #2, Room 1204<br>801 N. Randolph St.<br>Arlington, Virginia 22203 |

- |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | COL. George Caridakis<br>Director, Office of Manpower<br>Utilization<br>Headquarters<br>Marine Corps (A01H) MCB<br>Quantico, Virginia 22134   | 1 | Technical Director<br>Personnel Research Division<br>Bureau of Naval Personnel<br>Washington, D. C. 20370                   |
| 1 | Special Assistant for Research<br>and Studies<br>OASN (M&RA)<br>The Pentagon, Room 4E794<br>Washington, D. C. 20350   | 1 | Technical Library (Pers-11B)<br>Bureau of Naval Personnel<br>Department of the Navy<br>Washington, D. C. 20360              |
| 1 | Mr. George N. Graine<br>Naval Ship Systems Command<br>(SHIPS 03H)<br>Department of the Navy<br>Washington, D. C. 20360  | 1 | Technical Library<br>Naval Ship Systems Command<br>National Center<br>Building 3, Room 3<br>S-08<br>Washington, D. C. 20360 |
| 1 | Chief<br>Bureau of Medicine and Surgery<br>Code 513<br>Washington, D. C. 20390  | 1 | Mr. A. F. McKinnell<br>Bureau of Naval Personnel<br>(Pers-B2212)<br>Washington, D. C. 20370                                 |
| 1 | Program Coordinator<br>Bureau of Medicine and Surgery<br>(Code 71G)<br>Department of the Navy<br>Washington, D. C. 20390  | 1 | Pers-B221<br>Bureau of Naval Personnel<br>Washington, D. C. 20370   |
| 1 | Research Director, Code 06<br>Research and Evaluation Department<br>U. S. Naval Examining Center<br>Building 2711 - Green Bay Area<br>Great Lakes, Illinois 60088<br>ATTN: C.S. Winiewicz | 1 | Office of Naval Research<br>Area Office<br>1076 Mission Street<br>San Francisco, California 94103                           |
| 1 | Superintendent<br>Naval Postgraduate School<br>Monterey, California 93940<br>ATTN: Library (Code 2124)  | 1 | Commander<br>Operational Test and Evaluation<br>Force<br>U. S. Naval Base<br>Norfolk, Virginia 23511                        |
| 1 | Technical Director<br>Naval Personnel Research and<br>Development Laboratory<br>Washington Navy Yard<br>Building 200<br>Washington, D. C. 20390   | 1 | Commander Naval Air Reserve<br>Naval Air Station<br>Glenview, Illinois 60026  |
|   |   | 1 | Commanding Officer<br>Naval Medical Neuropsychiatric<br>Reserve Unit<br>San Diego, California 92152                         |

- 1 CDR Richard L. Martin, USN  
COMFAIRMIRAMAR F-14  
NAS Miramar, California 92145
- 1 Mr. Lee Miller (AIR 413E)  
Naval Air Systems Command  
5600 Columbia Pike  
Falls Church, Virginia 22042
- 1 Dr. James J. Regan  
Code 55  
Naval Training Device Center  
Orlando, Florida 32813
- 1 Technical Reference Library  
Naval Medical Research Institute  
National Naval Medical Center  
Bethesda, Maryland 20014
- 1 Dr. A. L. Slafkosky  
Scientific Advisor (Code Ax)  
Commandant of the Marine Corps  
Washington, D. C. 20380
- 1 LCDR. Charles J. Theisen, Jr.,  
MSC, USN  
CSOT  
Naval Air Development Center  
Warminster, Pennsylvania 18974
- 1 Assistant Chief for Research (Code 400)  
Office of Naval Research  
Arlington, Virginia 22217
- 1 Director of Research (Code 401)  
Office of Naval Research  
Arlington, Virginia 22217
- 1 Director (Code 460)  
Naval Applications and Analysis  
Division  
Office of Naval Research  
Arlington, Virginia 22217
- 1 Deputy Chief Scientist  
Office of Naval Research Area Office  
207 West 24th Street  
New York, N.Y. 10011
- 1 Head of Manpower Training and  
Reserve Group (Op-964D)  
Room 4A538, The Pentagon  
Washington, D.C. 20350
- 1 Assistant to the Assistant Deputy Chief  
of Naval Operations (Manpower)  
(Op-01BZ2)  
Room 4E473, The Pentagon  
Washington, D.C. 20350
- 1 Deputy Director, Program Management  
Office  
Naval Material Command (03PB)  
Room 868, Crystal Plaza #6  
2221 Jefferson Davis Highway  
Arlington, Virginia 20360
- 1 Program Administrator, Personnel &  
Training Support  
Naval Material Command (93424)  
820 Crystal Plaza #6  
2221 Jefferson Davis Highway  
Arlington, Virginia 20360
- 1 Special Assistant for Enlisted  
Force Analysis  
Naval Bureau of Personnel (Ax)  
Room 2611, Arlington Annex  
Washington, D.C. 20370
- 1 Head, Project Volunteer Coordination  
Branch  
Naval Bureau of Personnel (A25)  
Room 2603, Arlington Annex  
Washington, D. C. 20370
- 1 Special Assistant to the Chief of  
Naval Personnel  
Naval Bureau of Personnel (0e)  
Room 2403, Arlington Annex  
Washington, D.C. 20370

## ARMY

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>1 Behavioral Sciences Division<br/>Office of Chief of Research and<br/>Development<br/>Department of the Army<br/>Washington, D. C. 20310</p> <p>1 U.S. Army Behavior and Systems<br/>Research Laboratory<br/>Rosslyn Commonwealth Building<br/>Room 239<br/>1300 Wilson Boulevard<br/>Arlington, Virginia 22209</p> <p>1 Director of Research<br/>U.S. Army Armor Human Research<br/>Unit<br/>ATTN: Library<br/>Building 2422 Morade Street<br/>Fort Knox, Kentucky 40121</p> <p>1 COMMANDANT<br/>U.S. Army Adjutant General School<br/>Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana<br/>46216<br/>ATTN: ATSAG-EA</p> <p>1 Armed Forces Staff College<br/>Norfolk, Virginia 23511<br/>ATTN: Library</p> | <p>1 Commanding Officer<br/>ATTN: LTC Montgomery<br/>USACDC - PASA<br/>Ft. Benjamin Harrison, Indiana<br/>46249</p> <p>1 Director<br/>Behavioral Sciences Laboratory<br/>U.S. Army Research Institute of<br/>Environmental Medicine<br/>Natick, Massachusetts 01760</p> <p>1 Commandant<br/>United States Army Infantry School<br/>ATTN: ATSN-H<br/>Fort Benning, Georgia 31905</p> <p>1 U.S. Army Research Institute<br/>Room 239<br/>Commonwealth Building<br/>1300 Wilson Boulevard<br/>Arlington, Virginia 22209<br/>ATTN: Dr. R. Dusek</p> <p>1 Mr. Edmund Fuchs<br/>BESRL<br/>Commonwealth Building, Room 239<br/>1320 Wilson Boulevard<br/>Arlington, Virginia 22209</p> |
|--|---|

## AIR FORCE

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>1 Dr. Robert A. Bottenberg<br/>AFHRL/PHS Lackland AFB<br/>Texas 78236</p> <p>1 AFHRL/MD<br/>701 Prince Street<br/>Room 200<br/>Alexandria, Virginia 22314</p> <p>1 AFOSR (NL)<br/>1400 Wilson Boulevard<br/>Arlington, Virginia 22209</p> | <p>1 COMMANDANT<br/>USAF School of Aerospace Medicine<br/>ATTN: Aeromedical Library (SCL-4)<br/>Brooks AFB, Texas 78235</p> <p>1 AFHRL (TR/Dr. G. A. Eckstrand)<br/>Wright-Patterson Air Force Base<br/>Ohio 45433</p> <p>1 AFHRL (TRT/Dr. Ross L. Morgan)<br/>Wright-Patterson Air Force Base<br/>Ohio 45433</p> |
|--|---|

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>1 Personnel Research Division<br/>AFHRL<br/>Lackland Air Force Base<br/>San Antonio, Texas 78236</p> <p>1 Headquarters, U.S. Air Force<br/>Chief, Personnel Research and<br/>Analysis Division (AF/DPXY)<br/>Washington, D. C. 20330</p> | <p>1 Research and Analysis Division<br/>AF/DPXYR Room 4C200<br/>Washington, D. C. 20030</p> <p>1 CAPT Jack Thorpe USAF<br/>Dept. of Psychology<br/>Bowling Green State University<br/>Bowling Green, Ohio 43403</p> |
|---|---|

#### DOD

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>1 Mr. Joseph J. Cowan, Chief<br/>Psychological Research Branch<br/>(P-1)<br/>U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters<br/>400 Seventh Street, S.W.<br/>Washington, D. C. 20590</p> <p>1 Dr. Ralph R. Canter<br/>Director for Manpower Research<br/>Office of Secretary of Defense<br/>The Pentagon, Room 3D986<br/>Washington, D. C. 20301</p> | <p>1 Dr. Charles Ullman<br/>Chief of Counseling, Training<br/>Programs<br/>OSD (M&amp;RA)<br/>The Pentagon, Room 2C252<br/>Washington, D. C. 20301</p> |
|--|--|

#### OTHER GOVERNMENT

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>1 Dr. Alvin E. Goins, Chief<br/>Personality and Cognition Research<br/>Section<br/>Behavioral Sciences Research<br/>Branch<br/>National Institute of Mental Health<br/>5600 Fishers Lane<br/>Rockville, Maryland 20852</p> <p>1 Dr. Lorraine D. Eyde<br/>Bureau of Intergovernmental<br/>Personnel Programs<br/>Room 2519<br/>U.S. Civil Service Commission<br/>1900 E. Street, N.W.<br/>Washington, D. C. 20415</p> | <p>1 Office of Computer Information<br/>Center for Computer Sciences and<br/>Technology<br/>National Bureau of Standards<br/>Washington, D.C. 20234</p> <p>1 Dr. Andrew R. Molnar<br/>Computer Innovation in Education Section<br/>Office of Computing Activities<br/>National Science Foundation<br/>Washington, D. C. 20550</p> |
|---|---|

# MISCELLANEOUS

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>1 Dr. Scarvia Anderson<br/>Executive Director for Special<br/>Development<br/>Educational Testing Service<br/>Princeton, New Jersey 08540</p>  | <p>1 ERIC<br/>Processing and Reference Facility<br/>4833 Rugby Avenue<br/>Bethesda, Maryland 20014</p>  |
| <p>1 Professor John Annett<br/>The Open University<br/>Waltonteaale, BLETCHLEY<br/>Bucks, England</p>   | <p>1 Dr. Victor Fields<br/>Department of Psychology<br/>Montgomery College<br/>Rockville, Maryland 20850</p>                                      |
| <p>1 Dr. Richard C. Atkinson<br/>Department of Psychology<br/>Stanford University<br/>Stanford, California 94305</p>                              | <p>1 Mr. Paul P. Foley<br/>Naval Personnel Research and<br/>Development Laboratory<br/>Washington Navy Yard<br/>Washington, D. C. 20390</p>       |
| <p>1 Dr. Bernard M. Bass<br/>University of Rochester<br/>Management Research Center<br/>Rochester, New York 14627</p>                             | <p>1 Dr. Bert Green<br/>Department of Psychology<br/>Johns Hopkins University<br/>Baltimore, Maryland 21218</p>                                   |
| <p>1 Dr. David G. Bowers<br/>Institute for Social Research<br/>University of Michigan<br/>Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106</p>                           | <p>1 Dr. Richard S. Hatch<br/>Decision Systems Associates, Inc.<br/>11428 Rockville Pike<br/>Rockville, Maryland 20852</p>                        |
| <p>1 Dr. Kenneth E. Clark<br/>University of Rochester<br/>College of Arts and Sciences<br/>River Campus Station<br/>Rochester, New York 14627</p> | <p>1 Dr. M. D. Havron<br/>Human Sciences Research, Inc.<br/>Westgate Industrial Park<br/>7710 Old Springhouse Road<br/>McLean, Virginia 22101</p> |
| <p>1 Dr. Rene V. Dawis<br/>Department of Psychology<br/>324 Elliott Hall<br/>University of Minnesota<br/>Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455</p>         | <p>1 Human Resources Research<br/>Organization<br/>Division #3<br/>Post Office Box 5787<br/>Presidio of Monterey, California<br/>93940</p>        |
| <p>1 Dr. Robert Dubin<br/>Graduate School of Administration<br/>University of California<br/>Irvine, California 92664</p>                         | <p>1 Human Resources Research<br/>Organization<br/>Division #4, Infantry<br/>Post Office Box 2086<br/>Fort Benning, Georgia 31905</p>             |
| <p>1 Dr. Marvin D. Dunnette<br/>University of Minnesota<br/>Department of Psychology<br/>Elliott Hall<br/>Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455</p>        | <p>1 Human Resources Research<br/>Organization<br/>Division #5, Air Defense<br/>Post Office Box 6057<br/>Fort Bliss, Texas 79916</p>              |

- 1 Library  
HumRRO Division Number 6  
P.O. Box 428  
Fort Rucker, Alabama 36360
- 1 Dr. Lawrence B. Johnson  
Lawrence Johnson and Associates,  
Inc.  
2001 "S" Street, N.W.  
Suite 502  
Washington, D. C. 20009
- 1 Dr. Norman J. Johnson  
Associate Professor of Social Policy  
School of Urban and Public Affairs  
Carnegie-Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213
- 1 Dr. Roger A. Kaufman  
Graduate School of Human Behavior  
U.S. International University  
8655 E. Pomerada Road  
San Diego, California 92124
- 1 Dr. E. J. McCormick  
Department of Psychological  
Sciences  
Purdue University  
Lafayette, Indiana 47907
- 1 Dr. Robert R. Mackie  
Human Factors Research, Inc.  
Santa Barbara Research Park  
6780 Cortona Drive  
Goleta, California 93017
- 1 Dr. Stanley M. Nealy  
Department of Psychology  
Colorado State University  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80521
- 1 Mr. Luigi Petrullo  
2431 North Edgewood Street  
Arlington, Virginia 22207
- 1 Dr. Robert D. Pritchard  
Assistant Professor of Psychology  
Purdue University  
Lafayette, Indiana 47907
- 1 Psychological Abstracts  
American Psychological Association  
1200 Seventeenth Street, N.W.  
Washington, D. C. 20036
- 1 Dr. Diane M. Ransey-Klee  
R-K Research & System Design  
3947 Ridgemont Drive  
Malibu, California 90265
- 1 Dr. Joseph W. Rigney  
Behavioral Technology Laboratories  
University of Southern California  
3717 South Grand  
Los Angeles, California 90007
- 1 Dr. Leonard L. Rosenbaum,  
Chairman  
Department of Psychology  
Montgomery College  
Rockville, Maryland 20850
- 1 Dr. George E. Rowland  
Rowland and Company, Inc.  
Post Office Box 61  
Haddonfield, New Jersey 08033
- 1 Dr. Benjamin Schneider  
Department of Psychology  
University of Maryland  
College Park, Maryland 20742
- 1 Dr. Arthur I. Siegel  
Applied Psychological Services  
Science Center  
404 East Lancaster Avenue  
Wayne, Pennsylvania 19087
- 1 Dr. Henry Solomon  
George Washington University  
Department of Economics  
Washington, D. C. 20006
- 1 Dr. David Weiss  
University of Minnesota  
Department of Psychology  
Elliott Hall  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455



1 Mr. Edmond Marks  
109 Grange Building  
Pennsylvania State University  
University Park, Pennsylvania  
16802

1 Dr. Anita S. West  
Denver Research Institute  
University of Denver  
Denver, Colorado 80210

1 Century Research Corporation  
4113 Lee Highway  
Arlington, Virginia 22207

1 LCOL Austin W. Kibler, Director  
Human Resources Research Office  
ARPA  
1400 Wilson Boulevard  
Arlington, Virginia 22209

1 Dr. Kenneth E. Young  
Vice President  
American College Testing Program  
Suite 340  
One Dupont Circle, N.W.  
Washington, D. C. 20036

PLANNING COMMITTEE FOR THE OFFICE OF NAVAL  
RESEARCH PROGRAM IN MANPOWER R&D

1 Dr. Robert J. Lundegard (Chairman)  
Director  
Mathematical and Information  
Sciences Division  
Code 430

1 LCDR Robert D. Matulka  
Research Program Officer  
Code 430C

1 Dr. Thomas C. Varley  
Program Director Operations  
Research  
Code 434

1 Mr. Marvin Denicoff  
Program Director Information  
Systems  
Code 437

1 Dr. Glenn L. Bryan (Program  
Manager) Director  
Psychological Sciences Division  
Code 450

1 Dr. H. Wallace Sinaiko  
Research Study Director  
Code 450

1 Dr. John A. Nagay  
Director Organizational  
Effectiveness Research Programs  
Code 452

1 Dr. Bert T. King  
Associate Director  
Code 452

1 Dr. Martin A. Tolcott  
Director Engineering Psychology  
Programs  
Code 455

1 Mr. Robert J. Miller  
Director Naval Analysis Programs  
Code 462

1 Mr. J. Randolph Simpson  
Supervisory Operations Research  
Analyst  
Code 462

# CONTRACTORS, OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH MANPOWER R&D PROGRAM

- |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Mr. Philip G. Bernard<br>B-K Dynamics, Inc.<br>2351 Shady Grove Road<br>Rockville, Maryland 20850                               | 1 | Mr. H. Dean Brown<br>Stanford Research Institute<br>333 Ravenswood Avenue<br>Menlo Park, California 94025                                   |
| 1 | Dr. Barry M. Feinberg<br>Bureau of Social Science<br>Research, Inc.<br>1200 Seventeenth Street, N.W.<br>Washington, D. C. 20036 | 1 | Dr. Robert Glaser<br>Learning Research and Development<br>Center<br>University of Pittsburgh<br>Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213              |
| 1 | Prof. Robert M. Oliver<br>University of California<br>Operations Research Center<br>Berkeley, California 94720                  | 1 | Dr. Duncan N. Hansen<br>Center for Computer-Assisted<br>Instruction<br>Florida State University<br>Tallahassee, Florida 32306               |
| 1 | Mr. John P. Thomas<br>Hudson Institute<br>Quaker Ridge Road<br>Croton-on-Hudson, New York<br>10520                              | 1 | Dr. Frederick M. Lord<br>Educational Testing Service<br>Princeton, New Jersey 08540   |
| 1 | Mr. James N. Kelly<br>Management Analysis Center, Inc.<br>745 Concord Avenue<br>Cambridge, Massachusetts<br>02138               | 1 | Mr. R. Bard Battelle<br>Stanford Research Institute<br>Naval Warfare Research Center<br>Menlo Park, California 94025                        |
| 1 | Dr. Lawrence Friedman<br>MATHEMATICA, Inc.<br>P.O. Box 2392<br>Princeton, New Jersey 08540                                      | 1 | Dr. Gloria L. Grace<br>System Development Corporation<br>2500 Colorado Avenue<br>Santa Monica, California 90406                             |
| 1 | Dr. Jack R. Borsting<br>Department of Operations Research<br>Naval Postgraduate School<br>Monterey, California 93940            | 1 | Dr. Leonard Carmichael<br>The Smithsonian Institution<br>Washington, D. C. 20560  |
| 1 | Prof. G. S. Watson<br>Princeton University<br>Department of Statistics<br>Princeton, New Jersey 08540                           | 1 | Prof. Gerald L. Thompson<br>Carnegie-Mellon University<br>Graduate School of Industrial<br>Administration<br>Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213 |
| 1 | Mr. Michael W. Brown<br>Operations Research, Inc.<br>1400 Spring Street<br>Silver Spring, Maryland 20910                        | 1 | CAPT John F. Riley, USN<br>Commanding Officer, U.S. Naval<br>Amphibious School<br>Coronado, California 92155                                |
|   |   | 1 | Mr. Will E. Lassiter<br>Data Solutions Corporation<br>5272 River Road, Suite 100<br>Bethesda, Md. 20016                                     |

1 Dr. Norman M. Abrahams  
Naval Personnel & Training  
Research Laboratory  
San Diego, California 92152

1 Dr. Herbert R. Northrup  
Wharton School of Finance  
& Commerce  
University of Pennsylvania  
Philadelphia, Pa. 19104

1 Prof. Ezra S. Krendel  
Department of Operations  
Research  
University of Pennsylvania  
Philadelphia, Pa. 19104

## DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - R &amp; D

(Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall report is classified)

## 1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author)

American Institutes for Research  
8555 Sixteenth Street  
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

## 2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

Unclassified

## 2b. GROUP

## 3. REPORT TITLE

An Exploratory Study of Enlistment Incentives  
Among Junior College Students

## 4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates)

Technical Memorandum No. 1

## 5. AUTHOR(S) (First name, middle initial, last name)

Abraham K. Korman, Barry E. Goodstadt, Albert S. Glickman, Alan P. Romanczuk

## 6. REPORT DATE

June 1973

## 7a. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES

32

## 7b. NO. OF REFS

4

## 8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO.

N00014-72-C-0387

## b. PROJECT NO.

NR 156-001

## 9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)

AIR-32201-6/73-TM-1

## 9b. OTHER REPORT NO(S) (Any other numbers that may be assigned this report)

## 10. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

## 11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

## 12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY

Personnel & Training Research Programs  
Office of Naval Research  
Arlington, Virginia 22217

## 13. ABSTRACT

A questionnaire designed to assess reaction to possible enlistment incentives was administered to 100 junior college students. A factor-analysis of the measure indicated the importance both of traditional tangible incentives and of the "newer" incentives of control over one's work life. The data also indicated that: a) low socio-economic individuals were less attracted to the Navy overall than those from middle-or-higher levels, and b) the traditional incentives were more important for the low socio-economic respondents while the newer incentives were more important for the higher level individuals.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.  
LOS ANGELES

OCT 19 1973

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR  
JUNIOR COLLEGE  
INFORMATION

14	KEY WORDS	LINK A		LINK B		LINK C	
		ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT
	Junior colleges Enlistment incentives Recruiting practices All-volunteer force						

Unclassified

Security Classification